

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.]
09/527,844	03/17/2000	Timothy J. Barberich	4821-334-999	3697	1
PENNIE & E	990 09/12/2003 DMONDS LLP		EXAMINER BAHAR, MOJDEH		
1667 K STREET NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1617 DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003	7	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
; · · · · ·	09/527,844	BARBERICH ET A	BARBERICH ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Mojdeh Bahar	1617		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ad	Idress	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	PPLICATION IN CONDITI avoid abandonment of th (1) a timely filed amendmeal (with appeal fee); or (3	ON FOR ALLOWANCE. is application. A proper relent which places the application at timely filed Request for	ply to a	
	war at the final rejection		to total da	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3.	ire later than SIX MONTHS from VAS FILED WITHIN TWO MON The date on which the petition upod of extension and the corresper of the shortened statutory periodfice later than three months a 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ITHS OF THE FINAL REJECTIOn of the 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the agonding amount of the fee. The a cod for reply originally set in the fifter the mailing date of the final r	N. See MPEP ppropriate extension ppropriate extension al Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37	CFK 1.191(d)), to avoid a	thin the period set forth in issue issued in the suppersion of the appeal.		
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entere	d because:			
(a) they raise new issues that would require fu	urther consideration and/o	r search (see NOTE below	'); .	
The insulation of now matter (see No	nte below):			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application	on in better form for appe			
(d) they present additional claims without car	nceling a corresponding n	umber of finally rejected Cia	aims.	
- the following re	ejection(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we	ould be allowable it submi			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ reques	o. Oco Continuation	•		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered	because it is not directed			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendi explanation of how the new or amended claim	ment(s) a)⊡ will not be ei ns would be rejected is pr	ntered or b)[_] will be enter ovided below or appended	ed and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_· is a\□ approved or b	al disapproved by the E	xaminer.	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	19 a)[_] apploted of a	ner No(s).	. On	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	tement(s)(F10-1443) Fa	W/ 0	SVL	
10. ☐ Other:		11/~ d/~		

*atent and Trademark Office *303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: no unrebutted arguments as to the obviousness rejection have been presented. Applicant's arguments regarding the 102 rejection have been considered, but are not persuasive. Note that it is well established patent law that the Examiner is to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim language. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation, when the Skilled Artisan administers ziprasidone to a patient, he inevitably administers its metabolites Therefore the administration of metabolites of ziprasidone are inherent in administering the drug, ziprasidone.

Note that the case at bar is distinguishable from the Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals. In the dicta, on page 7, the Court reasons that metabolites are not categorically anticipated by the drug itself. It further explains that a metabolite in its isolated and/or pure form is not anticipated by the drug itself. Note that no pure or isolated metabolite of ziprasidone is claimed herein. Therefore applicant's reliance on Schering is misplaced.